TABLE OF CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXE (CUTIVE	SUMMAR	RY	ES-1
	ES.1	INTRODU	CTION AND AUTHORITY	ES-1
	ES.2	PURPOSE	E AND NEED	ES-2
	ES.3	DESCRIP [*]	TION OF PROPOSED PROJECT	ES-3
	ES.4	POTENTIA	AL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	ES-5
		ES.4.1	Geology and Soils	
		ES.4.2	Surface Water and Coastal Processes	
		ES.4.3	Surface Water and Sediment Quality	ES-10
		ES.4.4	Wetland Resources and Waters of the U.S	
		ES.4.5	Air Quality	
		ES.4.6	Noise	
		ES.4.7	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	
		ES.4.8	Aquatic Resources	
		ES.4.9	Marine Mammals	
		ES.4.10	Threatened and Endangered Species	
		ES.4.11	Socioeconomics	
		ES.4.12	Environmental Justice	
		ES.4.13	Commercial Fisheries	
		ES.4.14	Recreation and Tourism	
		ES.4.15 ES.4.16	Public LandsLand Use and Land Cover	
		ES.4.10 ES.4.17	Aesthetics	
		ES.4.17 ES.4.18	Public Health and Safety, Including Flood Risk Reduction	E3-2 I
		LO.4.10	and Shoreline Protection	FS-22
		ES.4.19	Navigation	FS-23
		ES.4.20	Land-Based Transportation	
		ES.4.21	Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste	
		ES.4.22	Cultural Resources	
1.0	IN	TRODUCT	ION AND PURPOSE AND NEED	1-1
	1.1	PROJECT	INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1-1
		1.1.1	Project Location	
	1.2	PROJECT	BACKGROUND	
		1.2.1	History of the Barataria Basin	
		1.2.2	Project History	
	1.3	PROPOSE	ED PROJECT	1-7
	1.4	PURPOSE	AND NEED	1-9
	1.5	USACE CI	IVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN THE PROJECT AREA	1-10
		1.5.1	Navigation Projects	
		1.5.2	Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, Mississippi	
			River Levee	1-13
		1.5.3	Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System	
			Projects	1-13
		1.5.4	New Orleans to Venice Hurricane Protection Project,	
			Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana with Incorporation of Non-	
			Federal Levees	1-13

		1.5.5	Larose to Golden Meadow Project	
		1.5.6	Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion Project	
	1.6		F THE EIS	
		1.6.1	The OPA and DWH NRDA Decisions	
	1.7		NVOLVEMENT SUMMARY	
	1.8	AGENCY	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1-23
2.0	Α	LTERNATI	VES	2-1
	2.1	INTRODU	CTION	2-1
		2.1.1	Overview of Sediment Diversions	2-2
	2.2		AKEN TO IDENTIFY AND EVALUATE REASONABLE	
			TIVES	
		2.2.1	Define Project Objectives	
		2.2.2	Develop Screening Criteria	
		2.2.3	Develop Additional Considerations	2-9
		2.2.4	Process Used to Identify and Evaluate Alternatives to the Applicant's Preferred Alternative	2.0
	2.3	CTED 4. I	EVALUATION OF FUNCTIONAL ALTERNATIVES	
	2.3	2.3.1	Freshwater Diversion into the Barataria Basin	
		2.3.1	Structural Barriers	
		2.3.3	Shoreline Protection	
		2.3.4	Barrier Islands	
		2.3.5	Large-Scale Marsh Creation	
		2.3.6	Sediment Diversions with Marsh Creation	
		2.3.7	Multiple Small-Scale Diversions	
		2.3.8	Conclusions Based on Review of Functional Alternatives	2-25
	2.4		EVALUATION OF OPERATIONAL ALTERNATIVES –	
			N, OPERATIONAL TRIGGER, CAPACITY, AND BASE FLOW	
		2.4.1	Evaluation of Location Alternatives	
		2.4.2	Evaluation of Operational Trigger	
		2.4.3 2.4.4	Evaluation of Sediment Diversion Capacity Scenarios Evaluation of Additional Design Considerations	
	2.5		EVALUATION OF SEDIMENT DIVERSION OUTFALL	2-41
	2.5		EVALUATION OF SEDIMENT DIVERSION OUTFALL S	2 49
		2.5.1	Additional Considerations	
	2.6		Y OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED	2 10
	2.0		TAILED ANALYSIS	2-50
	2.7		ON ALTERNATIVE	
	2.8		ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED	2 01
	2.0		S	2-53
		2.8.1	Alternative 1: Variable Flow up to 75,000 cfs Maximum	2 00
			Sediment Diversion (Applicant's Preferred Alternative)	2-53
		2.8.2	Alternative 2: Variable Flow up to 75,000 cfs Maximum	
			Sediment Diversion Including Marsh Terrace Outfall	
			Features	2-71
		2.8.3	Alternative 3: Variable Flow up to 50,000 cfs Maximum	
			Sediment Diversion	2-72

		2.8.4	Alternative 4: Variable Flow up to 50,000 cfs Maximum Sediment Diversion Including Marsh Terrace Outfall Features	2 72
		2.8.5	Alternative 5: Variable Flow up to 150,000 cfs Maximum Sediment Diversion	
		2.8.6	Alternative 6: Variable Flow up to 150,000 cfs Maximum Sediment Diversion Including Marsh Terrace Outfall	
			Features	2-73
	2.9		Y OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES UNDER EACH TIVE	2-73
3.0	٨	EEECTED	ENVIRONMENT	2 1
3.0	3.1		CTION	
	3.1	3.1.1	Project Area	
		3.1.1	Physiographic Setting	
		3.1.2	Climate	
		3.1.3	Overview and History of the Project Area	
	0.0		·	
	3.2		Y AND SOILS	
		3.2.1	Geology, Topography, and Geomorphology	
		3.2.2	Faults	
		3.2.3	Mineral Resources	
		3.2.4	Soils	
		3.2.5	Prime Farmland	
	3.3		WATER RESOURCES	
		3.3.1	Aquifers	
		3.3.2	Groundwater Use	
		3.3.3	Groundwater Quality	
	3.4	SURFACE	WATER AND COASTAL PROCESSES	3-21
		3.4.1	Overview	3-21
		3.4.2	Hydrology and Hydrodynamics	3-26
		3.4.3	Stormwater Management and Drainage	3-36
	3.5	SURFACE	WATER AND SEDIMENT QUALITY	3-36
		3.5.1	Water Quality Standards and Designated Uses	
		3.5.2	Ambient Water Quality, Including Salinity	
		3.5.3	Sediment Quality	
	3.6		RESOURCES AND WATERS OF THE U.S.	
	0.0	3.6.1	Wetland Types in the Project Area	
		3.6.2	Wetland Loss	
		3.6.3	Wetland Invasive Plants	
	3.7		ITY	
	3.1	3.7.1	Regulatory Setting	
		3.7.1	Existing Conditions	
	0.0	_	•	
	3.8	NOISE		
		3.8.1	Noise Fundamentals	
		3.8.2	Regulatory Overview	
	_	3.8.3	Existing Conditions	
	3.9		RIAL WILDLIFE AND HABITAT	
		3.9.1	Historical Context	
		3.9.2	Vegetation	3-88

Final iii

	3.9.3	Terrestrial Wildlife	3-92
	3.9.4	Terrestrial Invasive Species	3-97
3.10	AQUATION	C RESOURCES	3-100
	3.10.1	Historical Context	3-101
	3.10.2	Aquatic Vegetation	3-102
	3.10.3	Benthic Resources	
	3.10.4	Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)	3-106
	3.10.5	Aquatic Fauna	
	3.10.6	Aquatic Invasive Species	
3.11	MARINE	MAMMALS	
	3.11.1	Marine Mammals in the Northern Gulf of Mexico	3-145
	3.11.2	Marine Mammals in Barataria Bay and Surrounding	
		Areas	
	3.11.3	Habitat Preferences and Environmental Requirements	
	3.11.4	Existing Threats	
3.12		ENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	
	3.12.1	Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species	
	3.12.2	State-listed and Special Status Species	
3.13		CONOMICS	3-176
	3.13.1	Economy, Employment, Businesses, and Industrial	
		Activity	
	3.13.2	Population	
	3.13.3	Housing and Property Values	
	3.13.4	Tax Revenue	
	3.13.5	Public Services and Utilities	
	3.13.6	Community Cohesion	
	3.13.7	Protection of Children	
3.14		RCIAL FISHERIES	
	3.14.1	Overview	
	3.14.2	Shrimp Fishery	
	3.14.3	Oyster Fishery	
	3.14.4	Crab Fishery	
	3.14.5	Finfish Fishery	
	3.14.6 3.14.7	Aquaculture	
2 4 5		Seafood Industry Regional Economic Contribution	
3.15		NMENTAL JUSTICE	
3.16		ATION AND TOURISM	
	3.16.1	Introduction	
	3.16.2	Recreational Fishing	
	3.16.3	Hunting	
	3.16.4 3.16.5	Wildlife Watching, Including Birding Recreational Boating Activities	
	3.16.6	Visitation to Non-governmental Protected Areas	
2 47		LANDS	
3.17			
	3.17.1 3.17.2	Barataria Basin Birdfoot Delta	
0.40			
3.18		SE AND LAND COVER	
	3.18.1	Historical Land Cover	
	3.18.2	Existing Land Use/Land Cover	5-252

Final iv

		3.18.3	Zoning	3-254
		3.18.4	Future Land Use	
	3.19	AESTHET	IC AND VISUAL RESOURCES	3-257
		3.19.1	Existing Environment	3-257
		3.19.2	Potential Visual Receptors	
	3.20	PUBLIC H	EALTH AND SAFETY, INCLUDING FLOOD AND STORM	
			RISK REDUCTION	3-258
		3.20.1	Overview	3-258
		3.20.2	Storm Surge and Flooding	
		3.20.3	Risk Reduction Measures	3-263
	3.21	NAVIGATI	ON	
		3.21.1	Mississippi River	
		3.21.2	Federal Channels in the Barataria Basin	3-274
	3.22	LAND-BAS	SED TRANSPORTATION	3-278
		3.22.1	Roads	3-278
		3.22.2	Rail	3-281
	3.23		OUS, TOXIC, AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE ASSESSMENT	
		3.23.1	Records Review	
		3.23.2	Field Survey	3-287
	3.24	CULTURA	L RESOURCES	
		3.24.1	Prehistoric and Historical Background of the Project Area	
		3.24.2	Cultural Resources Compliance	3-290
		3.24.3	Cultural Resources in the Project Areas of Potential	
			Effect	
			Invoctigations and Camplianca	
		3.24.4	Investigations and Compliance	3-292
4 0	FN		·	
4.0		NVIRONME	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	
4.0	EN 4.1	NVIRONME Approac	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-1
4.0		NVIRONME APPROAC CONSEQL	ENTAL CONSEQUENCESCH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES	4-1 4-1
4.0		AVIRONME APPROAC CONSEQU 4.1.1	ENTAL CONSEQUENCESCH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES	4-1 4-1 4-2
4.0		APPROAC CONSEQU 4.1.1 4.1.2	ENTAL CONSEQUENCESCH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCESContext	4-14-14-24-3
4.0	4.1	APPROAC CONSEQU 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-14-24-34-5
4.0		APPROACE CONSEQUENT 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY	ENTAL CONSEQUENCESCH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES Context	4-14-14-24-34-5
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-14-24-34-54-14
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT A.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-34-144-14
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-34-54-144-14
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-34-144-144-154-46
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-34-144-144-154-46
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES CH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES Context Intensity Overview of Delft3D Basinwide Model for Impact Analysis AND SOILS Area of Potential Impacts Guidelines for Geology and Soils Impact Determinations Geology, Topography, and Geomorphology Mineral Resources Soils and Prime Farmland Summary of Potential Impacts	4-14-24-54-144-144-154-464-52
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES CH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES Context Intensity Overview of Delft3D Basinwide Model for Impact Analysis AND SOILS Area of Potential Impacts Guidelines for Geology and Soils Impact Determinations Geology, Topography, and Geomorphology Mineral Resources Soils and Prime Farmland Summary of Potential Impacts WATER RESOURCES	4-14-34-144-144-154-464-52
4.0	4.1	APPROACE APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 GROUNDY	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES CH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES Context Intensity Overview of Delft3D Basinwide Model for Impact Analysis AND SOILS Area of Potential Impacts Guidelines for Geology and Soils Impact Determinations Geology, Topography, and Geomorphology Mineral Resources Soils and Prime Farmland Summary of Potential Impacts	4-14-34-144-144-154-524-56
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 GROUNDY 4.3.1	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-54-144-144-154-564-56
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUE 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 GROUNDY 4.3.1	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES CH TO EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JENCES Context Intensity Overview of Delft3D Basinwide Model for Impact Analysis AND SOILS Area of Potential Impacts Guidelines for Geology and Soils Impact Determinations Geology, Topography, and Geomorphology Mineral Resources Soils and Prime Farmland Summary of Potential Impacts WATER RESOURCES Area of Potential Impacts Guidelines for Groundwater Resources Impact Determinations Construction Impacts	4-14-24-54-144-144-154-504-564-56
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 GEOLOGY 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 GROUNDY 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-14-34-144-144-154-564-564-564-574-59
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL AL	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-34-144-144-154-564-564-564-594-61
4.0	4.1	APPROACE CONSEQUENT ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL AL	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-14-24-54-144-144-154-564-564-564-614-63

	4.4.2	Guidelines for Surface Water/Coastal Processes Impact Determinations	4.62
	4.4.3	Overview of Modeling for Impact Analysis	
	4.4.3 4.4.4	Hydrology and Hydrodynamics	
	4.4.5	Stormwater Management and Drainage	
	4.4.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.5	-	WATER AND SEDIMENT QUALITY	
4.5	4.5.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.5.1	Guidelines for Water and Sediment Quality Impact	4-120
	4.3.2	Determinations	<i>1</i> _120
	4.5.3	Overview of Modeling for Impact Analysis	
	4.5.4	Construction Impacts	
	4.5.5	Operational Impacts	
	4.5.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	
	4.5.7	Section 408 Impacts	
4.6	_	RESOURCES AND WATERS OF THE U.S.	
4.0	4.6.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.6.2	Overview of Modeling Impact Analysis	
	4.6.3	Guidelines for Wetland Impact Determinations	
	4.6.4	Construction Impacts	
	4.6.5	Operational Impacts	
	4.6.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.7	AIR QUAI	TY	
•••	4.7.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.7.2	Guidelines for Air Quality Impact Determinations	
	4.7.3	Construction Impacts	
	4.7.4	Operational Impacts	
	4.7.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.8	NOISE		4-270
	4.8.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-270
	4.8.2	Guidelines for Noise Impact Determinations	4-272
	4.8.3	Construction Impacts	4-272
	4.8.4	Operational Impacts	4-278
	4.8.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-280
4.9	TERREST	RIAL WILDLIFE AND HABITAT	4-282
	4.9.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-282
	4.9.2	Guidelines for Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat Impact	
		Determinations	4-282
	4.9.3	Construction Impacts	4-284
	4.9.4	Operational Impacts	
	4.9.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.10	AQUATIC	RESOURCES	4-307
	4.10.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.10.2	Guidelines for Aquatic Resource Impact Determinations	
	4.10.3	Construction Impacts	
	4.10.4	Operational Impacts	
	4.10.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.11		IAMMALS	
	4.11.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.11.2	Guidelines for Marine Mammal Impact Determinations	4-436

	4.11.3	Overview of Impact Analysis Approach	4-436
	4.11.4	Construction Impacts	4-442
	4.11.5	Operational Impacts	4-448
	4.11.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-497
4.12	THREAT	ENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	4-501
	4.12.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.12.2	Federally Listed or Proposed Threatened and	
		Endangered Species	4-502
	4.12.3	State-listed Threatened and Endangered Species	
	4.12.4	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-537
4.13	SOCIOE	CONOMICS	4-539
	4.13.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.13.2	Guidelines for Socioeconomics Impact Determinations	
	4.13.3	Key Drivers of Socioeconomic Operational Impacts	
	4.13.4	Construction Impacts	
	4.13.5	Operational Impacts	
	4.13.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-582
4.14	COMME	RCIAL FISHERIES	
	4.14.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.14.2	Guidelines for Commercial Fishing Impact	
		Determinations	4-587
	4.14.3	Construction Impacts	4-589
	4.14.4	Operational Impacts	4-590
	4.14.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-621
4.15	ENVIRO	NMENTAL JUSTICE	4-625
	4.15.1	Area of Potential Impact	
	4.15.2	Guidelines for Environmental Justice Impact	
		Determinations	4-627
	4.15.3	Construction Impacts	4-628
	4.15.4	Operational Impacts	4-631
	4.15.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-648
4.16	RECREA	ATION AND TOURISM	4-654
	4.16.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-654
	4.16.2	Overview of Methodology and Sources for Analysis	
	4.16.3	Guidelines for Recreation and Tourism Impact	
		Determinations	4-655
	4.16.4	Construction Impacts	4-656
	4.16.5	Operational Impacts	4-658
	4.16.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-673
4.17	PUBLIC	LANDS	4-677
	4.17.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-677
	4.17.2	Guidelines for Public Lands Impact Determinations	4-677
	4.17.3	Construction Impacts	4-678
	4.17.4	Operational Impacts	4-679
	4.17.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-684
4.18	LAND US	SE AND LAND COVER	4-686
-	4.18.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.18.2	Guidelines for Land Use/Land Cover Impact	
		Determinations	4-686
	4.18.3	Construction Impacts	4-686

	4.18.4	Operational Impacts	4-69
	4.18.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-694
4.19	AESTHE	TIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES	4-697
	4.19.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-697
	4.19.2	Guidelines for Aesthetic and Visual Resources Impact	
		Determinations	4-697
	4.19.3	Construction Impacts	4-698
	4.19.4	Operational Impacts	4-699
	4.19.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-703
4.20	PUBLIC	HEALTH AND SAFETY, INCLUDING FLOOD AND STORM	
	HAZARD	RISK REDUCTION	4-704
	4.20.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-704
	4.20.2	Guidelines for Public Health and Safety Impact	
		Determinations	
	4.20.3	Overview of Model for Impact Analysis	
	4.20.4	Storm Surge and Flooding	
	4.20.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	4-764
4.21	NAVIGA [*]	TION	
	4.21.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.21.2	Overview of Modeling Impact Analysis	
	4.21.3	Guidelines for Navigation Impact Determinations	
	4.21.4	Mississippi River	
	4.21.5	Barataria Basin	
	4.21.6	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.22	LAND-BA	ASED TRANSPORTATION	
	4.22.1	Area of Potential Impacts	4-80
	4.22.2	Guidelines for Land-Based Transportation Impact	
		Determinations	
	4.22.3	Roads	
	4.22.4	Rail	
	4.22.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.23		OOUS, TOXIC, AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE ASSESSMENT	
	4.23.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.23.2	Guidelines for HTRW Impact Determinations	
	4.23.3	Construction Impacts	
	4.23.4	Operational Impacts	
	4.23.5	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.24		RAL RESOURCES	
	4.24.1	Area of Potential Impacts	
	4.24.2	Construction Impacts	
	4.24.3	Operations Impacts	
	4.24.4	Summary of Potential Impacts	
4.25		ATIVE IMPACTS	
	4.25.1	Methodology for Assessing Cumulative Impacts	
	4.25.2	Geology and Soils	
	4.25.3	Groundwater	
	4.25.4	Surface Water and Coastal Processes	
	4.25.5	Surface Water and Sediment Quality	
	4.25.6	Wetland Resources and Waters of the U.S	
	4.25.7	Air Quality	4-91′

Final viii

		4.25.8	Noise	4-913
		4.25.9	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	4-917
		4.25.10	Aquatic Resources	4-922
		4.25.11	Marine Mammals	4-929
		4.25.12	Threatened and Endangered Species	4-934
		4.25.13	Socioeconomics	4-943
		4.25.14	Commercial Fisheries	4-948
		4.25.15	Environmental Justice	
		4.25.16	Recreation and Tourism	
		4.25.17	Public Lands	
		4.25.18	Land Use and Land Cover	
		4.25.19	Aesthetic and Visual Resources	4-968
		4.25.20	Public Health and Safety, Including Flood and Storm	
			Hazard Risk Reduction	
		4.25.21	Navigation	
		4.25.22	Land-Based Transportation	
		4.25.23	Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste	
		4.25.24	Cultural Resources	
		4.25.25	Cumulative Impacts Analysis 2022 Addendum	4-990
	4.26	ADDITIO	NAL CONSIDERATIONS IN PLANNING	4-997
		4.26.1	Relationship Between Short-term Use of the Human	
			Environment and Long-term Productivity	4-997
		4.26.2	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	
		4.26.3	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-999
		4.26.4	Consideration of Incomplete or Unavailable Information	4-1001
	4.27	MITIGAT	ION SUMMARY	4-1010
		4.27.1	Avoidance and Minimization	4-1012
		4.27.2	Compensatory Mitigation	
		4.27.3	Potential Permit Special Conditions	
5.0	С	ONSULTA	ATION AND COORDINATION	5-1
	5.1	Complian	ce with Laws, Regulations, and Executive Orders	5-1
	5.2		ing Agency Review Process (General)	
	5.3	-	Wildlife Coordination Act Report Recommendations	
	5.5	risii aliu	Wildlife Coordination Act Report Recommendations	5-0
6.0	LI	ST OF PR	REPARERS	6-1
7.0	D		/OLVEMENT	7 4
<i>.</i> . U			VOLVEMENT	
	7.1		T WEBSITE	
	7.2		RY OF SCOPING PROCESS	
		7.2.1	Notice of Intent	
		7.2.2	Scoping Meetings	
		7.2.3	Scoping Comments	
	7.3		RY OF DRAFT EIS PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS	
		7.3.1	Opportunity for Public Comments	7-4
		7.3.2	Distribution of Documents for Public Review	
		7.3.3	Summary of Public Meetings	
	7.4	OPPORT	UNITY FOR PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE FINAL EIS	7-8
	7.5		OF DECISION	

Final ix

X

	7.6	OTHER	PUBLIC OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS	7-9
		7.6.1	DWH NRDA Restoration Planning	7-9
			Applicant's Outreach Efforts	
8.0	Δ	CRONYN	1 LIST	8-1
9.0	II	NDEX		9-1
10 N	6	FEEREN	CES	10_1

List of Appendices

Appendix A Permit Application (Section 10/404) and Permissions Request

(Section 408)

Appendix B Public Involvement

Appendix C Notice of Intent

Appendix D Alternatives Information

Appendix E Delft3D Basinwide Modeling

Appendix F MBSD Design and Operations Information

Appendix G Wetlands/Waters of the U.S.

Appendix H Socioeconomics Technical Information

Appendix I Traffic Study

Appendix J Hazardous Toxic and Radioactive Waste Assessment

Appendix K Cultural Resources Information

Appendix L Water Quality Information

Appendix M Terrestrial Habitat and Wildlife Report

Appendix N Aquatic Resources including Essential Fish Habitat

Appendix O Biological Assessment & Biological Opinion

Appendix P Flood and Storm Hazards Evaluation

Appendix Q Navigation/Dredging Analysis

Appendix R Mitigation & Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plans

Appendix S Compliance Documentation

Appendix T USFWS Coordination Act Report (CAR)

Appendix U Summary of Select Natural and Man-made Diversions in

Southeastern Louisiana

Final xi

List of Tables

Table 1.6-1	Example Comment Topics Expressed in Public Scoping Comments and EIS Chapters that Address Them	1-15
Table 1.7-1.	Summary of Substantial Changes to the Final EIS as a Result of Comments on the Draft EIS, Updated Project Designs, and	
T-bl- 4.0.4	Continued Project Coordination	1-17
Table 1.8-1	Proposed MBSD Project NEPA Contributing Agencies and Relevant Authorities	1 2/
Table 1.8-2	National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Consultation	
Table 1.8-3	FAST-41 Agency Roles	
Table 1.3-1	Comparison of Functional Alternatives to Screening Criteria	
Table 2.4-1	Diversion Sizes Considered in Previous Studies	
Table 2.4-2	Sediment Load Summary	
Table 2.6-1	Summary of Alternatives Considered but Eliminated	
Table 2.8-1	Project Design Elements	
Table 2.8-2	Project Construction and Operational Footprint Acreages (60 percent design)	
Table 2.9-1	Comparative Summary of Potential MBSD Impacts Under Each Alternative (as Compared to the No Action Alternative unless	
T-51-044	Otherwise Stated)	
Table 3.1-1	Parish Acreages in Project Area	
Table 3.2-1	Summary of Oil/Gas Wells in the Project Area by Well Status	
Table 3.3-1	Groundwater Withdrawals, in Million Gallons per Day (Mgal/d)	
Table 3.4-1	Summarized Water Levels within the Barataria Basin	3-29
Table 3.5-1	LDEQ Generated TMDLs for Subsegments within the Barataria Basin	3-38
Table 3.5-2	Ambient Water Quality Data Used to Describe Project Area	3-39
Table 3.5-3	Specific Conductance versus Salinity at 77°F (25°C)	3-41
Table 3.5-4	Comparison of Mississippi River and Barataria Basin Temperature and Specific Conductance	3-41
Table 3.5-5	Monthly Average Salinity (ppt) at Select Barataria Basin Stations	
Table 3.5-6	Average Monthly Nutrient Concentrations in the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin	
Table 3.5-7	Parameters for Dredge Sediment Quality Evaluations: USEPA Priority Pollutants, Contaminants of Concern (COC), and Conventional Parameters	
Table 3.6-1	Wetland Habitat Types Occurring within the Project Area	
Table 3.6-1	Common Plant Species Occurring within the Project Area by	3-03
Table 3.0-2	Wetland Type	3-66
Table 3.6-3	Potential Invasive Wetland Plant Species and Habitat Type in the Barataria Basin	
Table 3.7-1	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	
Table 3.8-1	Sound Levels and Relative Loudness	

Final xii

Table 3.8-2	FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria Hourly A-weighted Sound Level Decibels	3-86
Table 3.8-3	Nearest Noise Sensitive Areas to the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project Facilities	
Table 3.9-1	Terrestrial Habitat Types and Ranks in the Barataria Basin Ecoregions	
Table 3.9-2	Select Terrestrial Wildlife Species in the Project Area	
Table 3.9-3	Primary Terrestrial Invasive Plant Species Reported for Parishes in the Barataria Basin	
Table 3.10-1	Benthic Lower Trophic Level Taxa and Habitat Associations in the Barataria Basin	3-105
Table 3.10-2	Essential Fish Habitat in the Barataria Basin and Nearshore Shelf Waters Off Louisiana	3-110
Table 3.10-3	Modeled Habitat and Environmental Requirements for Fauna in the Barataria Basin	3-117
Table 3.10-4	Potential Aquatic Invasive Animal Species Occurring within the Barataria Basin	3-144
Table 3.11-1	Information on Dolphin Stocks Considered in the Proposed Project EIS	3-147
Table 3.11-3	BBES Dolphin Prey Species Based on Stomach Contents	3-159
Table 3.11-4	Marine Mammal Hearing Groups	
Table 3.12-1	Special Status Species Potentially Occurring in the Project Area	3-166
Table 3.12-2	State-listed Species and Species of Concern Potentially Occurring in the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion	3-175
Table 3.13-1	Average Annual Establishment Count, Employment, and Pay by Industry for All Parishes Intersecting the Project Area (2019)	3-179
Table 3.13-2	Population of Parishes within or Partially in the Project Area	
Table 3.13-3	NFIP Flood Insurance Premiums as of 2022	3-184
Table 3.13-4	FEMA Estimates of Increases in Flood Insurance Premiums under Risk Rating 2.0	3-185
Table 3.13-5	Sales, Property, and Income Tax Revenues by Parish	3-186
Table 3.13-6	Coastal Community Well-being Indicators by Parish, 2012	3-190
Table 3.13-7	Percentage of Children in Poverty by Parish (2014 to 2018)	3-191
Table 3.14-1	Number of Licensed Commercial Fishers Active in the Barataria and Mississippi River Basins, Average 2014 to 2018	3-193
Table 3.14-2	Project Area Landings by Species Group (lbs), Average 2014 to 2018	
Table 3.14-3	Average Annual Shrimp Activity by Area Fished, 2014 to 2018	
Table 3.14-4	Average Annual Oyster Activity by Area Fished, 2014 to 2018	
Table 3.14-5	Average Annual Crab Activity by Area Fished, 2014 to 2018	
Table 3.14-6	Average Annual Saltwater Finfish Activity by Area Fished, 2014 to 2018	3-208
Table 3.14-7	Average Annual Freshwater Finfish Activity by Area Fished, 2014 to 2018	
Table 3.14-8	2012 Aquaculture in the Project Area by Parish	

Final xiii

Table 3.14-9	Economic Impacts of the Louisiana Seafood Industry, 2019 (Without Imports) (Millions of 2017 Dollars)	.3-213
Table 3.14-10	Commercial Fishing Engagement and Reliance Indices by Coastal	
T 11 0 45 4	Community, 2017	. 3-214
Table 3.15-1	Minority Populations for Census Block Groups within or Intersecting the Project Area (average, 2014 to 2018)	2 217
Table 3.15-2	Economic Indicators for Census Block Groups Intersecting the	. 5-2 17
Table 5.15-2	Project Area (average, 2014 to 2018)	.3-218
Table 3.15-3	Percent of Population 65 Years and Over for Census Block Groups Intersecting the Project Area (2014 to 2018)	.3-219
Table 3.15-4	Coastal Communities in the Project Area with Potential Minority and Low-Income Fishing and Hunting Participation	.3-221
Table 3.15-5	Community Social Vulnerability Indices by Coastal Community, 2016	.3-222
Table 3.15-6	Communities with Minority and/or Low-Income Populations Considered and Selected for Environmental Justice Impact Analysis	.3-224
Table 3.16-1	Recreation Areas in the Project Area	.3-233
Table 3.16-2	Recreational Fishing and Boating Access Facilities in the Project	.0 200
145.5 5.15 2	Area	.3-234
Table 3.16-3	MRIP-estimated Recreational Fishing Trips by Parish, 2010 to 2016	. 3-239
Table 3.16-4	Recreational Fishing Engagement and Reliance Indices by Coastal Community, 2014	.3-240
Table 3.16-5	Estimated Annual Boating Trips by Site in the Barataria Basin	
Table 3.16-6	Estimated Fishing Trips by Year in the Barataria Basin, 2014 to 2018	.3-242
Table 3.16-7	Average Annual Number of Hunting Licenses by Type, 2010 to 2017	.3-244
Table 3.16-8	Estimated Annual Shoreline Trips by Area in the Barataria Basin	
Table 3.16-9	Motorboat Registrations by Parish, 1988 to 2011	
Table 3.18-1	Project Area Land Use Types	.3-253
Table 3.21-1	Mississippi River Channel Vessel Transits, New Orleans to Head	
Table 2 21 2	of Passes	. 3-27 1
Table 3.21-2	Mississippi River Cargo Tons (000) by River Segment and Major Commodity Groups by Foreign and Domestic Sources, 2016	. 3-272
Table 3.21-3	Lower Mississippi River Deep-Draft Port Commodity Tons (000)	
-	by Domestic and Foreign Cargo, 2016	
Table 3.21-4	Barataria Basin Vessel Transits	
Table 3.21-5	Barataria Basin Commercial Waterborne Cargo (in tons)	
Table 3.22-1	LA 23 AADT in the Project Area (2015)	. 3-280
Table 3.23-1	Potential REC Sites Identified in Federal, State, and Tribal Databases	. 3-283
Table 4.1-1	Summary of Mississippi River Historical Representative Hydrographs for each Modeled Decade of Operations	4-7
Table 4.1-2	Summary of Mississippi River Additional Hydrographs	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Final xiv

Table 4.1-3	Mean Number of Days Diversion is Projected to be Operational by Decade	4-10
Table 4.1-4	Sea-level Rise Rates used in Delft3D Basinwide Model	
Table 4.2-1	Approximate Area of Excavation/Dredging during Construction	4-17
Table 4.2-2	General Description of Project Alternatives	4-19
Table 4.2-3	Model-projected Total Land Area under the No Action Alternative	4-21
Table 4.2-4	Delft3D Basinwide Model-projected Cumulative Net Changes in Retained Sediment Volume and Land Area under Action Alternatives Relative to No Action Alternative (NAA)	4-24
Table 4.2-5	Model-projected Total Land Area Under No Action Alternative (NAA) and Net Changes in Land Area (ac) Relative to NAA under All Alternatives	
Table 4.2-6	Summary of Potential Impacts on Geology and Soils from Each Alternative	
Table 4.3-1	Summary of Potential Impacts on Groundwater from Each Alternative	
Table 4.4-1	Stations for Comparison of Project Impacts	
Table 4.4-2	Progression of Changes in Bed Elevation for No Action Alternative at Six Locations in the Barataria Basin for the Modeled Period 2020 to 2070	4-70
Table 4.4-3	Changes in Bed Elevation for Project Alternatives at Six Locations in the Barataria Basin and Birdfoot Delta for the Modeled Period 2020 to 2070 Relative to No Action Alternative	4-73
Table 4.4-4	Maximum Monthly Average Water Level Differences for Project Alternatives at Seven Locations in the Barataria Basin for the Modeled Period 2020 to 2070 relative to No Action Alternative (Representative Hydrograph)	4-84
Table 4.4-5	Tidal Changes for No Action 2040 and 2070 Conditions Compared to No Action 2020 Conditions May 1994 Hydrograph – High, Consistent Spring Flow (Diversion Operating above Base Flow).	
Table 4.4-6	Tidal Impacts for Alternatives Compared to the No Action Alternative Modeled Years 2020, 2040, and 2070, May 1994 Hydrograph (High, Consistent Spring Flow; Diversion Operating Above Base Flow)	. 4-104
Table 4.4-7	Summary of Potential Impacts on Surface Water and Coastal Processes from Each Alternative	
Table 4.5-1	Stations for Comparison of Project Impacts	.4-131
Table 4.5-2	Minimum and Maximum Average Monthly Salinities, All Project Alternatives (2020-2070) (ppt)	. 4-141
Table 4.5-3	DO Ranges at Six Barataria Basin Stations: Comparison between No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2020 to 2070)	. 4-187
Table 4.5-4	Summary of Potential Impacts on Water and Sediment Quality from Each Alternative	
Table 4.5-5	Projected Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion Opening	
Table 4.5-6	Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion Number of Open Days 2015 to 2019	
	2010	. 4-2 13

Final xv

Table 4.6-1	Wetlands and Waters of the U.S. within the Project Construction Footprint	.4-217
Table 4.6-2	Model-projected Total Wetland Area, by Basin, under the No Action Alternative	
Table 4.6-3	Results of Vegetation Modeling and Projected Acreage of Wetland Acreage, by Decade and Wetland Type, for the Project Alternatives	.4-241
Table 4.6-4	Percentage of Wetland Gains and Losses when Compared with the No Action Alternative Acres (Percent)	.4-244
Table 4.6-5	Results of the Wetland Value Assessment in Net Acres and AAHUs for Project Construction Impacts	.4-256
Table 4.6-6	Results of the Wetland Value Assessment in Net AAHUs for the Project Alternatives as Compared with the No Action Alternative, by Decade	.4-257
Table 4.6-7	Results of the Wetland Value Assessment for Fresh/Intermediate Habitats in Net AAHUs for the Project Alternatives as Compared with the No Action Alternative, by Decade	
Table 4.6-8	Results of the Wetland Value Assessment for Brackish/Saline Habitats in Net AAHUs for the Project Alternatives as Compared with the No Action Alternative, by Decade	
Table 4.6-9	Summary of Potential Impacts on Wetlands from Each Alternative	
Table 4.7-1	Summary of Potential Emissions from Concrete Manufacturing Plant (Tons per Day)	.4-265
Table 4.7-2	Summary of Potential Emissions from Back-up Generator (Tons per Year)	.4-267
Table 4.7-3	Summary of Potential Impacts on Air Quality from Each Alternative	.4-269
Table 4.8-1	A-weighted (dBA) Sound Levels of Typical Construction Equipment and Modeled Attenuation at Various Distances	.4-274
Table 4.8-2	Noise Levels Associated with Outdoor Construction and Estimated Impacts on NSAs	.4-275
Table 4.8-3	Estimated Sound Levels from Underwater Noise Sources	
Table 4.8-4	Summary of Potential Impacts on Resources Exposed to Noise from Each Alternative	.4-280
Table 4.9-1	Summary of HIS Results for Modeled Species Under the No Action Alternative	.4-293
Table 4.9-2	HSI Scores for No Action Alternatives for Select Species and Polygons and Comparison of Operational Alternatives to the No Action Alternative	.4-298
Table 4.9-3	Summary of Potential Impacts on Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat from Each Alternative	.4-304
Table 4.10-1	Acoustic Thresholds for Fish	.4-318
Table 4.10-2	Estimated Zone of Influence from Underwater Sounds for Fish	.4-319
Table 4.10-3	Change in Winter Salinity Regime Over Time	
Table 4.10-4	Dominant Taxa and Trends Before, During, and After the 1997 Opening of the Bonnet Carré Spillway	

Final xvi

Table 4.10-5	Projected Salinity Ranges by Decade at Representative Stations with Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-356
Table 4.10-6	Summary of Key Species Impacts	
Table 4.10-7	HSI Scores for No Action Alternatives for Select Species and Polygons and Comparison of Operational Alternatives to the No	4 400
Table 4.10-8	Action Alternative Summary of Potential Impacts on Aquatic Resources from Each Alternative	4-426 4-430
Table 4.11-1	Acoustic Thresholds for Mid-frequency Cetaceans (including dolphins)	4-445
Table 4.11-2	Estimated Zone of Influence from Underwater Sounds for Mid- frequency Cetaceans (including dolphins)	4-446
Table 4.11-3	Stations Used for Comparison of Proposed Project Impacts on BBES Dolphins	4-451
Table 4.11-4	Projected Durations of the Median Longest Streak of Low-Salinity Exposure (less than 5 ppt) in a Given Year for a Simulated BBES Dolphin Population under the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative (Average River Flow Hydrograph)	4-487
Table 4.11-5	Projected Mean Annual Survival Rates Due to Low-salinity Exposure for a Simulated BBES Dolphin Population under the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in the First Decade of the Proposed Project	4-487
Table 4.11-6	Differences between the Projected Duration of Low-Salinity Exposure (less than 5 ppt) for a Simulated BBES Dolphin Population under the No Action Alternative (NAA) and Each Action Alternative	4-493
Table 4.11-7	Differences between the Projected Mean Survival Rate due to Low-salinity Exposure of a Simulated BBES Dolphin Population under the No Action Alternative (NAA) and Each Action Alternative	4-494
Table 4.11-8	Summary of Potential Impacts on Marine Mammals from Each Alternative	4-498
Table 4.12-1	Endangered Species Act Determinations, as identified in the Project Biological Assessment	4-504
Table 4.12-2	Acoustic Thresholds for Sea Turtles	4-512
Table 4.12-5	Summary of Potential Impacts on Threatened and Endangered Species from Each Alternative	4-537
Table 4.13-1	Economic Benefits of Engineering and Design – Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2018\$)	4-548
Table 4.13-2	Economic Benefits from Construction – Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2018\$)	4-549
Table 4.13-3	Economic Benefits from Construction – 50,000 cfs Alternative (2018\$)	4-556
Table 4.13-4	Economic Benefits from Construction – 150,000 cfs Alternative (2018\$)	4-557
Table 4.13-5	Assessed Values of Residential Properties Located near the Proposed Project Site outside Flood Protection	4-570

Final xvii

Table 4.13-6	Summary of Potential Impacts on Socioeconomics from Each Alternative	4-582
Table 4.14-1	Expected Trends in Project Area Fish Abundance Under the No Action Alternative	4-591
Table 4.14-2	Expected Trends in the Project Area Fisheries Under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-607
Table 4.14-3	Summary of Potential Impacts on Commercial Fisheries from Each Alternative	4-622
Table 4.15-1	Summary of Communities where the Applicant's Preferred Alternative Could Impact Low-income and Minority Populations	4-637
Table 4.15-2	Projected Maximum Surge Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative for 1 Percent AEP (100-Year) Storms in 2040 and 2070	4-642
Table 4.15-3	Summary of Potential Impacts on Environmental Justice from Each Alternative	4-648
Table 4.16-1	Modeled Percent of Days of Restricted Access Due to Tidal Flooding	4-659
Table 4.16-2	Percentage of Angler Trips in the Barataria Basin Reporting Fish Species as Caught or Targeted, 2014 to 2018	4-660
Table 4.16-3	Comparison of Delft3D Basinwide-Modeled Wetland Acreages between the No Action Alternative and the Action Alternatives in Privately Managed Recreation Areas	4-662
Table 4.16-4	Expected Trends in the Barataria Basin Fish Abundance Under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative	4-666
Table 4.16-5	Summary of Potential Impacts on Recreation and Tourism from Each Alternative	4-673
Table 4.17-1	Comparison of Delft3D Basinwide-Modeled Wetland Acreages between the No Action Alternative (NAA) and the Action Alternatives in Public Lands	4-680
Table 4.17-2	Summary of Potential Impacts on Public Lands from Each Alternative	4-684
Table 4.18-1	Land Use Types Impacted by Project Construction Footprint	4-688
Table 4.18-2	Summary of Potential Impacts on Land Use and Land Cover from Each Alternative	4-695
Table 4.19-1	Summary of Potential Impacts on Aesthetic and Visual Resources from Each Alternative	4-703
Table 4.20-1	Projected Days of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under the No Action Alternative (2011 hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow])	4-715
Table 4.20-2	Number of Annual Days of Tidal Flooding Under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative Relative to the No Action Alternative	
Table 4.20-3	Projected Minimum and Maximum Storm Surge Elevation Increases for Year 2040 and 2070 Relative to Year 2020 for All Simulated 1 Percent AEP Storms under the No Action	
	Alternative (feet)	4-728

Final xviii

Table 4.20-4	Projected Minimum and Maximum Wave Height Increases for Year 2040 and 2070 relative to Year 2020 for All Simulated 1 Percent AEP Storms under the No Action Alternative(feet)	4-728
Table 4.20-5	Maximum Storm Surge Elevation and Projected Minimum and Maximum Storm Surge Elevation Increases from 2020 Elevation for Representative 1 Percent AEP Storm under the No Action Alternative	4-730
Table 4.20-6	Maximum Wave Height and Projected Minimum and Maximum Wave Height Increases from 2020 Elevation for Representative 1 Percent AEP Storm under the No Action Alternative	4-730
Table 4.20-7	Projected Storm Surge Under Applicant's Preferred Alternative Relative to the No Action Alternative for 1 Percent AEP (100-Year) Storms in Years 2040 and 2070	4-737
Table 4.20-8	Summary of Differences between the Applicant's Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative Maximum Wave Height for 1 Percent AEP Storms	4-737
Table 4.20-9	Projected Maximum Surge Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070 (feet)	
Table 4.20-10	Projected Maximum Wave Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070 (feet)	
Table 4.20-11	Projected Maximum Surge Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and 50,000 cfs for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070 (feet)	
Table 4.20-12	Projected Maximum Wave Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and 50,000 cfs Alternatives for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070 (feet)	
Table 4.20-13	Projected Maximum Surge Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and 150,000 cfs for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070	4-753
Table 4.20-14	Projected Maximum Wave Elevation Differences at the NOV-NFL Levee between the No Action Alternative and 150,000 cfs Alternatives for 1 Percent AEP and 4 Percent AEP Storms in 2040 and 2070 (feet)	
Table 4.20-15	Summary of Potential Impacts on Public Health and Safety, Including Flood and Storm Hazard Risk Reduction from Each Alternative	
Table 4.21-1	Mississippi River Passes Total Cargo Tons (000) by Major Commodity Group by Foreign and Domestic Sources, 2000 – 2016	
Table 4.21-2	Mississippi River Passes Total Cargo Tons (000) Forecasted Using Adjusted AACGR 2000-2016 for Petroleum (0.5) and Food and Farm (0.3) Groups, 2017 – 2036	
	1 000 and 1 ann (0.0) Groups, 2017 - 2000	4-112

Final xix

Table 4.21-3	GIWW Total Cargo Tons by Major Commodity Group by Foreign and Domestic Sources, 2000 – 2016	. 4-784
Table 4.21-4	GIWW Cargo Tons Forecasted Using AACGR 2000-2016 by Major Commodity Group, 2017 – 2036	. 4-785
Table 4.21-5	Barataria Bay Waterway Total Cargo Tons by Major Commodity	. 4-786
Table 4.21-6	Barataria Bay Waterway Cargo Tons Forecasted Using AACGR 2000-2016 by Major Commodity Group, 2017 – 2036	. 4-788
Table 4.21-7	Bayou Lafourche Total Cargo Tons by Major Commodity Group, 2000 – 2016	. 4-789
Table 4.21-8	Bayou Lafourche Cargo Tons Forecasted Using AACGR 2000- 2016 by Major Commodity Group, 2016 – 2036	. 4-791
Table 4.21-9	Summary of Potential Impacts on Commercial Navigation (including Maintenance Dredging) from Each Alternative	. 4-798
Table 4.22-1	Summary of Potential Impacts on Land-Based Transportation from Each Alternative	.4-812
Table 4.23-1	Summary of Potential Impacts Associated with HTRW from Each Alternative	.4-819
Table 4.24-1	CEMVN NRHP-Eligibility Determinations	.4-823
Table 4.24-2	Summary of Potential Impacts on Cultural Resources from Each	. 4-827
Table 4.25.1-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects Considered in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis	. 4-837
Table 4.25.2-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Cumulative Impacts on Geology and Soils concurrent with MBSD Project Construction and Operations	. 4-863
Table 4.25.2-2	Cumulative Net Changes in Retained Sediment Volume and Land Area: Foreseeable Projects with and without MBSD Project (150K+ Terraces Alternative)	
Table 4.25.4-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Cumulative Impacts on Hydrology and Hydrodynamics during MBSD Project	. 4-872
Table 4.25.4-2	Operations	
Table 4.25.5-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Cumulative Impacts on Water Quality during MBSD Project Construction and Operations	1_8 <i>81</i>
Table 4.25.5-2	Stations for Comparison of Cumulative Impacts	
Table 4.25.5-2	Cumulative Minimum and Maximum Average Monthly Salinities for	. 4-000
Table 4.25.5-5	the Reasonably Foreseeable Projects compared to MBSD Project Alternatives (2020 to 2070) (ppt)	4-891
Table 4.25.5-4	Cumulative Minimum and Maximum Average Monthly DO for the Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with and without the Proposed MBSD Project Action Alternatives (2020 to 2070)	
	(mg/L)	. 4-896

Final xx

Table 4.25.6-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Potential Cumulative Impacts on Wetlands during MBSD Project Construction and Operations	4-901
Table 4.25.6-2	Results of Vegetation Modeling and Projected Acreage of Wetland Acreage, by Decade and Wetland Type, for the Project Alternatives	d 4-907
Table 4.25.6-3	Wetland Gains and Losses when Compared with the No Action Alternative Acres (Percent)	4-908
Table 4.25.17-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Cumulative Impacts on Public Lands during Operation of the MBSD Project	4-962
Table 4.25.18-1	Other Actions within the Geographic and Temporal Scope for Cumulative Impacts on Land Use and Land Cover	4-967
Table 4.25.19-1	Other Actions with the Potential to Cumulatively Impact Aesthetic and Visual Resources	
Table 4.25.22-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Cumulative Impacts on Land-based Transportation during Construction of the Proposed MBSD Project	4-985
Table 4.25.24-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Projects within the Geographic and Temporal Scope for Cumulative Impacts on Cultural Resources during Operations	3
Table 4.25.25-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects Considered in the 2022 Cumulative Impacts Analysis Addendum	
Table 4.27-1	Best Management Practices	4-1013
Table 4.27-2	Avoidance and Minimization Measures	4-1017
Table 4.27-3	Summary of Wetland Impact and Benefits	4-1023
Table 5.1-1	Compliance with Environmental Laws, Regulations, and Executive Orders	
Table 6-1	List of Preparers	
Table 7-1	Primary Topics Identified in Scoping Comments	
Table 7-2	Summary of Public Engagement and Number of People Reached to Discuss Sediment Diversions in the Barataria Basin, including the proposed MBSD Project, from 2016 to 2020	
Table 7-3	Summary of Public Engagement and Number of People Reached to Discuss Sediment Diversions in the Barataria Basin, including the proposed MBSD Project, from January 2021 through July 2022	7-13

Final xxi

List of Figures

Figure ES-1.	Project Area (Barataria Basin and Western Portion of the Lower Mississippi River Delta Basin)	ES-3
Figure ES-2.	Selected Communities, Populations, and Major Levee Systems within the Project Area.	ES-17
Figure 1.1-1.	Project Area (Barataria Basin and Western Portion of the Lower Mississippi River Delta Basin)	
Figure 1.1-2.	Project Site Map.	
Figure 1.3-1.	Proposed MBSD Structure Intake System and Conveyance Channel	1-8
Figure 1.5-1.	Major Waterbodies in the Project Area	1-11
Figure 2.3-1.	Marsh Creation Cells.	
Figure 2.4-1.	Locations Considered Through the Iterative Planning Process:	2-31
Figure 2.4-2.	Comparison in Diversion Flow Regimes with On/Off Triggers of 300,000 cfs, 450,000 cfs, and 600,000 cfs.	
Figure 2.4-3.	Monthly Number of Days (Average Value over 50-year Data) when the Mississippi River Discharge is Above a Specific Threshold	2-37
Figure 2.4-4.	Differences in Discharge between Three Diversion Capacities Included in the Reasonable Range of Alternatives in this EIS	
Figure 2.8-1.	Project Design Features and Construction Footprint	2-56
Figure 2.8-2.	Proposed Project Design Features as Viewed from the Mississippi River	2-58
Figure 2.8-3.	Upstream View of the Proposed Conveyance Channel, Guide Levees, Stability Berms, and Siphon.	2-60
Figure 2.8-4.	Proposed Project Outfall Transition Feature in the Barataria Basin.	2-61
Figure 2.8-5.	Proposed Project Siphon and Drainage Structure	
Figure 2.8-6.	Proposed Project Drainage Structure and Location of Impounded Area (Polder)	2-64
Figure 2.8-7.	Illustration of Variable Flow for 75,000 (75k) cfs Diversions (bottom plot) Driven by 2011 Mississippi River Discharge (top plot) with a 450,000 cfs Operational Trigger in the Mississippi	
Figure 2.8-8.	River Illustration of Base Flow (5,000 cfs) and Variable Capacity Flow for 75,000 (75k) cfs, 50,000 (50k) cfs, and 150,000 (150k) cfs Diversions in Relation to the Mississippi River Discharge with a 450,000 cfs Operational Trigger in the Mississippi River	2-67 2-68
Figure 2.8-9.	Proposed Temporary Cofferdam and Trestle/Dock as Viewed from the Mississippi River.	
Figure 3.1-1.	Map of Project Area Boundaries and Watersheds within the Project Area.	
Figure 3.1-2.	Major Waterbodies in the Project Area, with Key Towns and Landmarks.	
Figure 3.2-1.	Land Area Change in Project Area (1932 to 2016)	
Figure 3.2-2.	Map of Oil/Gas Fields, Wells, and Pipelines within the Vicinity of the Location Proposed for the Project Diversion Structure	

Final xxii

Figure 3.2-3.	Map of Primary Soil Units in Project Area	3-17
Figure 3.2-4.	Prime Farmland in the Project Area	3-18
Figure 3.4-1.	Coastal Barrier Resources System Units in the Project Area	3-24
Figure 3.4-2.	Barataria Basin Model Grid Bed Elevations from the Delft Model Version 3. Figure is adapted from Sadid et al. 2018. Elevations are in referenced to NAVD88	3-27
Figure 3.4-3.	Water Level and Wind Speed at the Grand Isle, LA Station	
Figure 3.4-4.	Observed Water Levels at NOAA Stations at Southwest Pass (8760922) and Grand Isle (8761724)	
Figure 3.4-5.	Mississippi River Flow at the Tarbert Landing Gage	3-32
Figure 3.4-6.	Tarbert Landing Annual Total (Blue), Fine (Red) and Coarse (Green) Sediment Concentrations from 1959 to 2005	3-34
Figure 3.4-7.	Seasonal Flow Duration Curves at Tarbert Landing from 1963 to 2005 Showing the Range in Mississippi River Discharge by Season.	3-35
Figure 3.4-8.	Boxplots Showing Monthly Variation in Concentrations of Coarse- grained Sediments at Tarbert Landing from 1963 to 2005	
Figure 3.5-1.	Mississippi River Water Quality Subsegments in the Project Area	
Figure 3.5-2.	USGS, LDEQ, and CRMS Ambient Water Quality Stations Used for this Section.	3-40
Figure 3.5-3.	Monthly Specific Conductance Average (2006 to 2018) at Select Barataria Basin CRMS Sites.	3-43
Figure 3.5-4.	Correlation between Monthly Average Specific Conductance and Salinity (2006 to 2018) at Select CRMS Sites	3-44
Figure 3.5-5.	Generalized Seasonal Salinity Averages (2006 to 2018) at Select Barataria Basin CRMS Sites.	3-45
Figure 3.5-6.	Frequency of Mid-summer Hypoxia (oxygen ≤ 2 mg/l) over the 70 to 90 Station Grid on the Louisiana and Texas Shelf during the Summer from 1985 to 2014	3-51
Figure 3.5-7.	Monthly DO Average Concentrations in the Mississippi River at Belle Chasse (1977 to 2017) and at Select Barataria Basin Sites (2006 to 2018)	
Figure 3.5-8.	Monthly Atrazine Concentrations in the Mississippi River at Belle Chasse (2007 to 2017)	
Figure 3.5-9.	Sediment Quality Index Ratings for Barataria-Terrebonne Estuarine Complex	
Figure 3.6-1.	Wetland Types in the Project Area	
Figure 3.6-2.	Marsh Type Change in the Project Area, 1968 through 2013	
Figure 3.10-1.	Observed Shoreline Oiling in and around the Project Area	
Figure 3.10-2.	Possible Adverse Impacts of Nutrient Loading	
Figure 3.10-3.	Simplified Conceptual Diagram of the Food Web for the Barataria Basin.	
Figure 3.10-4.	Mean and Median CPUE of Small Juvenile Brown Shrimp (top), and Large Juveniles and Subadults (bottom) in the LDWF	
	Samples for the Barataria Basin	3-123

Final xxiii

Figure 3.10-5.	Mean and Median CPUE of Small Juvenile White Shrimp (top), and Large Juveniles and Subadults (bottom) in LDWF Samples from the Barataria Basin.	3-125
Figure 3.10-6.	Estimated Adult Abundance from the LDWF Stock Assessment Model and Observed Landings of Louisiana Blue Crab	
Figure 3.10-7.	Mean and Median CPUE of Small Juvenile Blue Crab in the LDWF 50-foot Seine Samples (top), and CPUE of Large Juveniles and Subadults in the LDWF 16-foot Trawl Samples (bottom) for the Barataria Basin.	3-128
Figure 3.10-8.	Mean and Median CPUE of Juvenile Bay Anchovy in the LDWF 50-foot Seine Samples (top), and of Juvenile and Adult Bay Anchovy in the 16-foot Trawls (bottom) for the Barataria Basin	
Figure 3.10-9.	Mean and Median CPUE of Juvenile Gulf Menhaden (top), and Adult Menhaden (bottom) for the Barataria Basin	3-131
Figure 3.10-10.	Mean and Median CPUE of Adult Red Drum in the LDWF Gillnet Samples (top) and in the Trammel Nets (bottom) for the Barataria Basin	3-133
Figure 3.10-11.	Mean and Median CPUE of Adult Spotted Seatrout in the LDWF Gillnet Samples for the Barataria Basin	3-135
Figure 3.10-12.	Seasonal Size Frequency Distributions for Atlantic Croaker in the Barataria Basin	3-136
Figure 3.10-13.	Monthly Mean CPUE of Large Juvenile and Adult Largemouth Bass in the LDWF Electrofishing Samples (1990 through early 2014)	
Figure 3.10-14.	Map of Public Oyster Areas for Louisiana.	
Figure 3.11-1.	Geographic Extent of the Northern Gulf of Mexico Stocks Considered in the Proposed Project EIS	
Figure 3.11-2.	Distribution of Common Bottlenose Dolphins during Photo- identification Surveys in the Barataria Basin in March and April 2019.	
Figure 3.11-3.	Range of Western Coastal and Northern Coastal Stocks	
Figure 3.11-4.	Sightings of Atlantic Spotted Dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico	
Figure 3.11-5.	Capture Locations for Barataria Bay Satellite-linked Tagging Efforts	
Figure 3.12-1.	Critical Habitat for Federally Listed Species in the Project Area	
Figure 3.13-1.	Map of Census Block Group Boundaries within or Intersecting the Project Area.	
Figure 3.13-2.	Population Density within the Project Area	
Figure 3.13-3.	Total Assessed Value of Homes in Plaquemines and Jefferson Parishes over Time in 2019 dollars	3-183
Figure 3.13-4.	Location of Public Service Facilities and Flood Protection Surrounding the Project Footprint.	3-188
Figure 3.14-1.	Trip Ticket Sub-basins and Public Oyster Seed Grounds in and near the Project Area.	
Figure 3.14-2.	Total Number of Licensed Fishers Active in the Barataria Basin, 2000 to 2018.	

Final xxiv

Figure 3.14-3.	Total Number of Licensed Fishers Active in the Mississippi River Basin, 2000 to 2018.	3-194
Figure 3.14-4.	Total Landings (millions of pounds) by Species Group from the Project Area (landings by area fished)	3-195
Figure 3.14-5.	Total Value of Landings by Species Group from the Project Area (landings by area fished)	3-196
Figure 3.14-6.	Average Louisiana Shrimp Landings by Gear Type and Vessel Length, 2000 to 2013.	3-198
Figure 3.14-7.	Total Shrimp Landings from the Project Area (landings by area fished).	3-201
Figure 3.14-8.	Total Oyster Landings from the Project Area (landings by area fished).	3-204
Figure 3.14-9.	Total Crab Landings from the Project Area (landings by area fished).	3-206
Figure 3.14-10.	Total Saltwater Finfish Landings from Project Area (landings by area fished).	3-209
Figure 3.15-1.	Selected Communities, Populations, and Major Levee Systems within the Project Area.	3-228
Figure 3.15-2.	Selected Communities for Environmental Justice Impact Analysis, with Data on Minority Populations by Census Block Groups within or intersecting the Project Area	3-229
Figure 3.15-3.	Selected Communities for Environmental Justice Impact Analysis, with Data on Low-income Populations by Census Block Groups within or intersecting the Project Area	3-230
Figure 3.15-4.	Proportion of Minority Populations by U.S. Census Block near the Proposed Project	
Figure 3.16-1.	Map of Recreation Resources in the Project Area.	
Figure 3.16-2.	Annual Saltwater and Basic Fishing License Sales for Residents and Non-residents in the Project Area, Average 2010 to 2017	
Figure 3.16-3.	Percent of License Sales in the Project Area Parishes as Percent of All Sales in State.	3-238
Figure 3.16-4.	Average Annual MRIP-estimated Recreational Fishing Trips in Project Area Parishes, 2010 to 2016.	3-239
Figure 3.16-5.	Average Annual Number of License Sales by Parish, 2010 to 2017.	3-245
Figure 3.16-6.	Average Annual Charter Fishing License Sales by Parish, 2010 to 2017.	3-249
Figure 3.18-1.	Land Cover and Land Use Types in the Project Area, 2019	3-254
Figure 3.18-2.	Zoning Districts in the Project Area.	
Figure 3.20-1.	Map of the Project area Depicting Integrated FEMA DFIRM and Digital Q3 Flood Data	3-260
Figure 3.20-2.	Communities and Subdivisions within the Barataria Basin and Outside Federal Levee Systems that could be Subject to Increased Water Levels during Operation of the Proposed	
	Project	3-261

Final xxv

Figure 3.20-3.	The Communities and Subdivisions Subject to Increased Water Levels during Operation of the Proposed Project are Largely	2 264
Figure 3.20-4.	Designated as Coastal High Hazard Areas	
Figure 3.21-1.	Reach of Active Dredging in the Lower Mississippi River from Venice to the Gulf of Mexico.	
Figure 3.22-1.	Major Roads and Railroads in the Project Area	
Figure 4.1-1.	Mississippi River Hydrograph for Five Historical Representative Flow Regime Years for Each Decade used in the Delft3D Basinwide Model	4-7
Figure 4.1-2.	Mississippi River Hydrographs for Four Additional Flow Regime Years for Each Decade used in the Delft3D Basinwide Model	4-9
Figure 4.1-3.	Sea-level Rise Curve Comparison: Delft3D Basinwide Model, with USACE, and NOAA	4-11
Figure 4.2-1.	Approximate Extent of Delft3D Basinwide Model Domain for the Barataria Basin and Mississippi River Birdfoot Delta	4-22
Figure 4.2-2.	Model-projected Land Loss and Gain in the Project Area Relative to the No Action Alternative in 2030 and 2040 under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-26
Figure 4.2-3.	Model-projected Land Loss and Gain in the Project Area Relative to the No Action Alternative in 2050 and 2060 under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-27
Figure 4.2-4.	Model-projected Land Loss and Gain in the Project Area Relative to the No Action Alternative in 2070 under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-28
Figure 4.2-5.	Model-projected Land Loss and Gain in the Immediate Vicinity (within 0.5-mile) of the Outfall Area Relative to the No Action Alternative in 2030, 2040, 2050, 2060, and 2070 under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-29
Figure 4.2-6.	Model-projected Land Area in the Project Area in the Barataria Basin under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative, and Fraction of the Remaining Area due to the Proposed Project	4-30
Figure 4.2-7.	Model-projected Change in Land Area in the Project Area in the Barataria Basin (left) and Mississippi River Birdfoot Delta (right) under the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	
Figure 4.2-8.	Google Earth Imagery Depicting Progression of Landform Development in the Wax Lake Outlet Delta between 1972 (left) and 2017 (right)	
Figure 4.2-9.	Google Earth Imagery Depicting Progression of Landform Development in the Vicinity of Caernarvon Diversion, in the Big Mar Receiving Basin between 1998 (left) and 2017 (right)	
Figure 4.2-10.	Google Earth Imagery Depicting Progression of Landform Development in the Vicinity of the West Bay Diversion between 2004 (left) and 2019 (right)	
Figure 4.2-11.	Potential Locations of Unidentified Faults in the Barataria Basin	

Final xxvi

4-41 4-43
4-43
4-44
4-65
4-69
4-72
4-74
4-76
4-78
4-79
4-80
4-81
4-83
4-86

Final xxvii

Figure 4.4-13.	Model-projected Water Surface and Bed Elevations for the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative at the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276)	4-87
Figure 4.4-14.	Water Levels for All Alternatives at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985).	4-88
Figure 4.4-15.	Water Levels for All Alternatives near Lafitte (USACE 82875)	
Figure 4.4-16.	Water Levels for All Alternatives at the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276)	4-89
Figure 4.4-17.	Water Levels for All Alternatives at the Central Station (CRMS 0224)	4-89
Figure 4.4-18.	Water Levels for All Alternatives at the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff).	4-90
Figure 4.4-19.	Water Levels at the Southwestern Station near Grand Isle (B. Pass at GI).	
Figure 4.4-20.	Water Levels for All Alternatives at the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163).	4-91
Figure 4.4-21.	Water Level Differences for the 3 rd Week of May, 2008 Historical Representative Hydrograph, 2070 Conditions, for All Action Alternatives compared to the No Action Alternative	4-93
Figure 4.4-22.	Water Level Differences for the 3 rd Week of May, Historical Representative Hydrograph, 2040 (1985 hydrograph) (Top Panel) and 2070 (2008 hydrograph) (Bottom Panel) Conditions, for 50,000 cfs Alternative Compared to the No Action	
	Alternative.	4-94
Figure 4.4-23.	Water Level Differences for the 3 rd Week of May, Historical Representative Hydrograph, 2040 (1985 hydrograph) (Top Panel) and 2070 (2008 hydrograph) (Bottom Panel) Conditions, for 150,000 cfs Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative	4-95
Figure 4.4-24.	No Action Alternative Water Level and Tide Signals at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) for 2020 and 2070 Modeled Years.	4-97
Figure 4.4-25.	No Action Alternative Water Level and Tide Signals at the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for 2020 and 2070 Modeled Years	
Figure 4.4-26.	No Action Alternative Water Level and Tide Signals at the Southwestern Station near Grand Isle (B. Pass at GI) for 2020 and 2070 Modeled Years	
Figure 4.4-27.	Water Level and Tide Signals at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985).	
Figure 4.4-28.	Water Level and Tide Signals at the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276).	
Figure 4.4-29.	Water Level and Tide Signals at the Southwestern Station near Grand Isle (B. Pass at GI)	.4-103
Figure 4.4-30.	Locations for Modeled Velocity Output	
Figure 4.4-31.	2020 (1970) Hydrograph, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at	
	Lafitte Oil and Gas Field (Near the Diversion)	.4-108

Final xxviii

Figure 4.4-32.	2020 (1970) Hydrograph, May, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at Lafitte Oil and Gas Field (Near the Diversion)	. 4-109
Figure 4.4-33.	2020 (1970) Hydrograph, October, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at Lafitte Oil and Gas Field (Near the Diversion)	. 4-110
Figure 4.4-34.	2070 (2008) Hydrograph, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at Lafitte Oil and Gas Field (Near the Diversion).	. 4-112
Figure 4.4-35.	2020 (1970) Hydrograph, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at Grand Bayou.	. 4-113
Figure 4.4-36.	2070 (2008) Hydrograph, Velocity Output for Applicant's Preferred Alternative (V3PR4) and No Action Alternative (V3PR1) at Grand Bayou.	. 4-114
Figure 4.4-37.	Zone of Influence (changes in cross-stream velocity) on Mississippi River Flow from Diversion Operations at the Surface (top panel) and near Bed (bottom panel)	
Figure 4.4-38.	Model-projected Sand and Fine Sediment Transport Mass for the Three Diversion Sizes (from Water Institute 2019)	
Figure 4.4-39.	Shear Stress Plots at High-Flow (left) and at 5,000 cfs Base Flow (right)	.4-120
Figure 4.4-40.	Local Watershed Division from the Construction of the Diversion Structure	
Figure 4.5-1.	Six Station Locations in the Barataria Basin and Birdfoot Delta	
Figure 4.5-2.	Modeled Monthly Average Salinity for the No Action Alternative at the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276), Central Station (CRMS 0224), Southwestern Station at Barataria Pass near Grand Isle (B. Pass at GI), Western Station (Little L. Cutoff), Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985), and Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	4-136
Figure 4.5-3.	Maps of No Action Alternative (Left Panels) and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (Right Panels) Salinity Averages (ppt) Modeled under the Historical Representative Hydrograph in Winter (January), Decades 2020 to 2029, 2040 to 2049, and 2060 to 2069.	. 4-138
Figure 4.5-4.	Maps of No Action Alternative (Left Panels) and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (Right Panels) Salinity Averages (ppt) Modeled under the Historical Representative Hydrograph in Spring (April), Decades 2020 to 2029, 2040 to 2049, and 2060 to 2069.	. 4-139
Figure 4.5-5.	Average Modeled Salinity at Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph	. 4-143
Figure 4.5-6.	Average Modeled Salinity at Central Station (CRMS 0224) and Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	

Final xxix

Figure 4.5-7.	Average Modeled Salinity at Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph	4-145
Figure 4.5-8.	Comparison of Hydrographs: Average Modeled Monthly Average Salinity at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for Applicant's Preferred Alternative under Representative Historical, 1994, 2006, 2010, and 2011 Mississippi River Hydrographs	4-148
Figure 4.5-9.	Comparison of Hydrographs: Average Modeled Monthly Average Salinity at the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for Applicant's Preferred Alternative under Representative Historical, 1994, 2006, 2010, and 2011 Mississippi River Hydrographs	4-149
Figure 4.5-10.	Comparison of Hydrographs: Average Modeled Monthly Average Salinity at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for Applicant's Preferred Alternative under Representative Historical, 1994, 2006, 2010, and 2011	
Figure 4.5-11.	Mississippi River Hydrographs	
Figure 4.5-12.	Average Modeled Temperature at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-13.	Average Modeled Temperature at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under	
Figure 4.5-14.	the Historical Representative Hydrograph. Average Modeled TN at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative	
Figure 4.5-15.	Hydrograph	
Figure 4.5-16.	Average Modeled TN at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-17.	Average Modeled NO ₃ fraction of TN at the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative under the Historical Representative	
	Hydrograph	4-164

Final xxx

Figure 4.5-18.	Average Modeled NO ₃ fraction of TN at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	.4-165
Figure 4.5-19.	Average Modeled NO ₃ fraction of TN at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	.4-166
Figure 4.5-20.	Average Modeled TP at Two Stations in Northern Barataria Basin: the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	.4-171
Figure 4.5-21.	Average Modeled TP at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-22.	Average Modeled TP at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-23.	Average PO ₄ fraction of TP at Two Stations in Northern Barataria Basin: the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-24.	Average PO ₄ fraction of TP at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	.4-176
Figure 4.5-25.	Average PO ₄ fraction of TP at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	.4-177
Figure 4.5-26.	Average modeled dissolved oxygen at Two Stations in Northern Barataria Basin: the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph	.4-182
Figure 4.5-27.	Average modeled dissolved oxygen at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-28.	Average modeled dissolved oxygen at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under	
	the Historical Representative Hydrograph	.4-184

Final xxxi

Figure 4.5-29.	Average Modeled TSS at Two Stations in Northern Barataria Basin: the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph	4-190
Figure 4.5-30.	Average Modeled TSS at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-31.	Average Modeled TSS at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	4-192
Figure 4.5-32.	Average Modeled Sulfate at Two Stations in Northern Barataria Basin: the Northern/Mid-Basin Station (CRMS 3985) and the Station Nearest the Diversion (CRMS 0276) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-33.	Average Modeled Sulfate at Two Stations in Central and Western Barataria Basin: the Central Station (CRMS 0224) and the Western Station (Little L. Cutoff) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-34.	Average Modeled Sulfate at the Southwestern Station, at Barataria Pass near Grande Isle (B. Pass at GI) and the Birdfoot Delta Station (CRMS 0163) for All Alternatives under the Historical Representative Hydrograph.	
Figure 4.5-35.	Map of Salinity Gauges and Isohaline Lines in the Barataria Basin used for Operation of the Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion	
Figure 4.6-1.	Wetlands within the Project Construction Footprint	
Figure 4.6-2.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2020	
Figure 4.6-3.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2030	4-225
Figure 4.6-4.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2040	4-225
Figure 4.6-5.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2050	4-226
Figure 4.6-6.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2060	4-226
Figure 4.6-7.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2070	
Figure 4.6-8.	Wetland Extent Near the Outfall Area for the Applicant's Preferred Alternative, by Decade	
Figure 4.6-9.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2020	4-237
Figure 4.6-10.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2030	
Figure 4.6-11.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2040	4-238
Figure 4.6-12.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2050	4-239
Figure 4.6-13.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2060	4-239
Figure 4.6-14.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2070	4-240
Figure 4.6-15.	Wetland Extent Near the Delta Formation Area for Each Action Alternative in 2070.	4-248
Figure 4.6-16.	Wetlands under the No Action Alternative in 2070	
Figure 4.6-17.	Wetlands under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2070	
Figure 4.6-18.	Wetlands under the 50,000 cfs Alternative in 2070	
Figure 4.6-19.	Wetlands under the 150,000 cfs Alternative in 2070	

Final xxxii

Figure 4.8-1.	Locations of Noise Sensitive Areas near Project Features	4-271
Figure 4.9-1.	Barataria Basin Spatial Polygons Identified by Number and Grouped for the Upper (1-3), Mid (4-12), and Lower Basin (13-18) Regions of the Estuary with the Birdfoot Delta (19, 20)	4-292
Figure 4.10-1.	Estimated SAV Coverage in the Project Outfall Area Based on Analysis of Remotely Sensed Aerial Data	
Figure 4.10-2.	Contour Plots for Predictors of SAV Occurrence	4-326
Figure 4.10-3.	Changes in Monthly Mean Winter Salinity Regimes Over Time for the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4-327
Figure 4.10-4.	Changes in Water Flow Direction Between the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative During Diversion Operation Above Base Flow Between 2020 and 2029	4-346
Figure 4.10-5.	Changes in Water Flow Direction Between the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative During Diversion Operation Above Base Flow Between 2050 and 2059.	4-347
Figure 4.10-6.	Bed Elevation Over Public Oyster Grounds from the Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2070 as Compared to the No Action Alternative.	4-349
Figure 4.10-7.	Projected Annual Variability in Salinity at the Barataria Waterway Station from 2020 to 2029 (left) and 2070 to 2079 (right)	4-357
Figure 4.10-8.	Projected Annual Variability in Salinity at the Grand Isle Station from 2020 to 2029 (left) and 2070 to 2079 (right)	4-358
Figure 4.10-9.	Stations for which Inter-annual Variability in Salinity Was Assessed	4-359
Figure 4.10-10.	Barataria Basin Spatial Polygons Identified by Number and Grouped for the Upper (1 to 3), Mid (4 to 12), and Lower Basin (13 to 18) Regions of the Estuary with the Birdfoot Delta (19,	4 074
Figure 4.10-11.	20)	4-371
Figure 4.10-12.	HSI Values for the No Action Alternative for (a) Brown Shrimp, (b) White Shrimp, and (c) Blue Crab through 2070	4-375
Figure 4.10-13.	HSI Values for the No Action Alternative for (a) Bay Anchovy, (b) Gulf Menhaden, and (c) Spotted Seatrout through 2070	4-378
Figure 4.10-14.	HSI Values for the No Action Alternative for (a) Atlantic Croaker, (b) Southern Flounder, and (c) Largemouth Bass through 2070.	
Figure 4.10-15.	HSI Values for the No Action Alternative for Eastern Oyster through 2070	4-385
Figure 4.10-16.	Difference in HSI for the 20 Polygons Over Time Compared to the No Action Alternative for (a) Brown Shrimp, (b) White Shrimp, and (c) Blue Crab.	4-390
Figure 4.10-17.	The Areal Proportion of Marsh to Open Water by Polygon for the No Action Alternative (top) and for the Applicant's Preferred Alternative (bottom) in Simulation Year 2020 and Year 2070	4-391

Final xxxiii

Figure 4.10-18.	Difference in HSI for the 20 Polygons Over Time Compared to the No Action Alternative for (a) Bay Anchovy, (b) Gulf Menhaden, and (c) Spotted Seatrout	.4-399
Figure 4.10-19.	Difference in HSI for the 20 Polygons Over Time Compared to the No Action Alternative for (a) Atlantic Croaker, (b) Southern Flounder, (c) Largemouth Bass, and (d) Eastern Oyster	.4-412
Figure 4.10-20.	Mean Cumulative Mortality (% +/- SD for All Tanks and Trials of Spat, Seed, and Market-sized Oysters Recorded Every Other Day)	.4-416
Figure 4.10-21.	HSI Values for the Applicant's Preferred Alternative for Eastern Oyster through 2070.	.4-422
Figure 4.11-1.	Approach to the Marine Mammal Impacts Assessment	.4-437
Figure 4.11-2.	BBES Dolphin Stock Management Boundary Relative to Sound Producing Elements of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project	.4-447
Figure 4.11-3.	Water Quality Station Locations in the Barataria Basin Compared to Usage Patterns of Four BBES Dolphins.	.4-450
Figure 4.11-4.	Average Modeled Salinity for the No Action Alternative for Five Example BBES Dolphin Usage Patterns under the Historical Representative Hydrographs for Each Decade	.4-451
Figure 4.11-5.	Average Modeled Salinity for the Applicant's Preferred Alternative for Five Example BBES Dolphin Usage Patterns under Historical Representative Hydrographs for Each Decade	.4-459
Figure 4.11-6.	The Difference in Average Modeled Salinity between the No Action Alternative and the Applicant's Preferred Alternative for Five Example BBES Dolphin Usage Patterns under the Historical Representative Hydrographs for Each Decade	
Figure 4.11-7.	Dose-response Curve Estimating How Continuous Exposure to Low-salinity Water Affects the Survival Probability of Compromised BSE Dolphins	
Figure 4.11-8.	Box-whisker Plot of Projected Mean Survival Rates for a Simulated BBES Population under the No Action Alternative Based Only on Effects from Salinity	
Figure 4.11-9.	Conceptual Model of How Low Salinity Can Cause Adverse Health Effects to Bottlenose Dolphins	
Figure 4.11-10.	Box-whisker Plot of Mean Survival Rates Due to Low-salinity Exposure for a Simulated BBES Population under the No Action Alternative (NAA) Compared to the Applicant's Preferred Alternative (APA)	.4-489
Figure 4.11-11.	Box-whisker Plot of Mean Survival Rates Due to Low-salinity Exposure for a Simulated BBES Dolphin Population under Four Proposed Project Alternatives.	.4-495
Figure 4.12-1.	No Action Alternative Identifying Projected Land Loss in the Project Area by 2070	
Figure 4.12-2.	Land Gain/Loss Relative to the No Action Alternative for the Year 2070.	

Final xxxiv

Figure 4.13-1.	Communities Outside of Federal Flood Protection Affected by Indirect Socioeconomic Impacts Related to Tidal Flooding Impacts of the Proposed Diversion Structure	4-541
Figure 4.13-2.	Canals and Waterways in the Barataria Basin within the Proposed Project Outfall Area.	
Figure 4.13-3.	Location of Public Service Facilities and Flood Protection Surrounding the Project Footprint	4-554
Figure 4.14-1.	Share of Commercial Landings by Species, Average Annual Value, and Pounds 2014 to 2018, for LDWF Sub-basins in the Project Area.	4-592
Figure 4.14-2.	Total Brown Shrimp Landings and Brown Shrimp Landings as a Percent of Commercial Landings in Project Area by Zip Code, (2018 Landings in Pounds)	4-596
Figure 4.14-3.	Total White Shrimp Landings and White Shrimp Landings as a Percent of Commercial Landings by Zip Code (2018 Landings in Pounds).	
Figure 4.14-4.	Total Oyster Landings and Oyster Landings as a Percent of Commercial Landings by Zip Code (2018 Landings in Pounds)	
Figure 4.15-1.	Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project Construction Footprint and Buffer Area	4 -620
Figure 4.15-2.	ADCIRC Stations and Adjacent Communities	
Figure 4.15-3.	Map of Ironton and the Project construction footprint	
Figure 4.16-1.	Navigation Channels Near the Proposed Project	
Figure 4.18-1.	Land Use and Land Cover in Project Construction Footprint, 2019.	
Figure 4.20-1.	Construction Footprint in Relation to 100-year Floodplain.	
Figure 4.20-2.	Projected Percent Days of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under the No Action Alternative for the 2011 Hydrograph (high, late spring flood flow)	
Figure 4.20-3.	Projected Percent Days of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under Applicant's Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative (2011 Hydrograph Internative International Elevation)	4 710
Figure 4.20-4.	[high, late spring flood flow]). Projected Days per Month in Year 2020 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under Applicant's Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative (2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow]).	
Figure 4.20-5.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2040 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under Applicant's Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative (2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow]).	
Figure 4.20-6.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2060 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation under Applicant's Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative	
Figure 4.20-7.	(2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow])	
	(2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow])	4-722

Final xxxv

Figure 4.20-8.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2040 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation Under 50,000 cfs Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative	4 700
Figure 4.20-9.	(2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow])	
Figure 4.20-10.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2020 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation Under 150,000 cfs Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow]).	
Figure 4.20-11.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2040 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation Under 150,000 cfs Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow]).	
Figure 4.20-12.	Projected Days per Month in Year 2060 of Water Surface Elevation Exceeding Inundation Threshold Elevation Under 150,000 cfs Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative (2011 Hydrograph [high, late spring flood flow]).	
Figure 4.20-13.	ADCIRC Data Stations Used for Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Height Analysis.	.4-729
Figure 4.20-14.	Simplified illustration of how increases in topography and land acreage in the delta formation area under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative influence storm surge elevation along a 50-mile cross-section of the Project area, as compared to No Action Alternative.	
Figure 4.20-15.	Simplified illustration of how increases in topography and land acreage in the delta formation area under the Applicant's Preferred Alternative influence storm surge elevation and wave height along a 10-mile cross-section of the delta formation area, as compared to No Action Alternative	
Figure 4.20-16.	Change in Maximum Surge Elevations during 1 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2040 less No Action Alternative in 2040.	
Figure 4.20-17.	Change in Maximum Wave Heights during 1 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2040 less No Action Alternative in 2040.	
Figure 4.20-18.	Change in Maximum Surge Elevations during 4 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2040 less No Action Alternative in 2040.	
Figure 4.20-19.	Change in Maximum Wave Heights during 4 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative in 2040 less No Action Alternative in 2040.	
Figure 4.20-20.	Change in Maximum Surge Elevations during 1 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative 2070 less No Action Alternative 2070.	

Final xxxvi

Figure 4.20-21.	Change in Maximum Wave Heights during 1 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative 2070 less No Action Alternative 2070.	4-744
Figure 4.20-22.	Change in Maximum Surge Elevations during 4 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative 2070 less No Action Alternative 2070.	
Figure 4.20-23.	Change in Maximum Wave Heights during 4 Percent AEP Storm: Applicant's Preferred Alternative 2070 less No Action Alternative 2070.	4-746
Figure 4.20-24.	Comparison of 1 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Height to Northern NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-757
Figure 4.20-25.	Comparison of 4 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Height to Northern NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-758
Figure 4.20-26.	Comparison of 1 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Heights to Central NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-759
Figure 4.20-27.	Comparison of 4 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Heights to Central NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-760
Figure 4.20-28.	Comparison of 1 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Heights to Southern NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-761
Figure 4.20-29.	Comparison of 4 Percent AEP Storm Surge Elevation and Wave Heights to Southern NOV-NFL Modeled Levee Height in Years 2020 and 2040 under the No Action Alternative and Applicant's Preferred Alternative.	4-762
Figure 4.21-1.	Mississippi River 60 Percent Conceptual Layout of Proposed Intake Structure with Temporary Cofferdam.	4-774
Figure 4.21-2.	Location of Federal Navigation Channels in Relation to Projected Sedimentation Impacts in Year 2070 of Project Operations	4-795
Figure 4.22-1.	Schematic Rendering of the Proposed LA 23 Bridge over the Proposed Diversion Channel.	4-804
Figure 4.24-1.	Deer Range, Bieber, and Ironton Cemeteries	4-825
Figure 4.25.1-1.	Map of Projects with Potential Cumulative Impacts	4-861
Figure 4.25.1-2.	Inset Map of Projects with Potential Cumulative Impacts	
Figure 4.25.4-1.	NOV-NF-W-05a.1 Project Map	4-882
Figure 4.25.4-2.	NOV-NF-W-05a.1 Project Map with Location of Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Channel	4-883
Figure 4.25.6-1.	Barataria Basin Wetlands Created and Sustained by Foreseeable Projects with and without the Proposed MBSD Project (based	

Final xxxvii

	on Delft3D Basinwide Model under then 150,000 cfs + Terraces Alternative).	.4-908
Figure 4.25.6-2.	Birdfoot Delta Wetlands Created and Sustained by Foreseeable Projects with and without the Proposed MBSD Project (based on Delft3D Basinwide Model under then 150,000 cfs + Terraces Alternative).	
Figure 4.25.25-1.	Map of 2022 Reasonably Foreseeable Projects with Potential	
	Cumulative Impacts	.4-992

Final xxxviii